

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LYRICFIND, INC.,
Plaintiff,

v.

MUSIXMATCH, S.P.A., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-02265-JSC

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE AMENDED
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
SEAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 14

On March 3, 2025, LyricFind, Inc. sued Musixmatch, S.p.A. and TPG Global, LLC (collectively, “Defendants”). (Dkt. No. 1.) Pending before the Court is LyricFind’s motion to seal portions of the complaint. (Dkt. No. 14.) LyricFind’s counsel attests “[t]he portions of the Complaint that were redacted on the public docket relate to non-public, confidential information about LyricFind’s and Defendants’ business strategies, including information that LyricFind previously agreed to keep confidential.” (Dkt. No. 14-1 ¶ 5.)

Because “courts of this country recognize a general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents,” the starting point is “a strong presumption in favor of access to court records.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2016). When a party seeks to seal documents relating to motions “more than tangentially related to the underlying cause of action,” *id.* at 1099, the party bears the burden of articulating “compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure,” *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (cleaned up). Compelling reasons may exist to seal where the documents contain “business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1097. Compelling reasons may also exist when the

documents “divulge terms of confidential contracts [or] contract negotiations.” *Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Qualcomm Inc.*, No. 17-CV-00220-LHK, 2019 WL 95922, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2019)

The “compelling reasons” standard applies here because a complaint is more than tangentially related to the underlying cause of action—it “forms the foundation of the lawsuit.” *In re Yahoo! Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 16-MD-02752-LHK, 2018 WL 9651897, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2018) (collecting cases applying the “compelling reasons” standard to requests to seal a complaint). Because the requested redactions are overbroad, the Court denies without prejudice LyricFind’s motion to seal. While specific information divulging confidential contracts may satisfy the “compelling reasons” standard for sealing, general information about the parties’ operations does not. The parties shall meet and confer to more narrowly tailor the requested redactions. The deadline to submit an amended sealing motion is May 30, 2025.

This Order disposes of Docket No. 14.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 25, 2025


JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
United States District Judge